

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/814,441	03/31/2004	Deniz Erdogmus	5853-406-1 5466			
30448 A K E D M A NI S	7590 01/23/2008 ENITEDEITT	EXAMINER				
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P.O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			JACOB, MARY C			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
•			2123	2123		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
	•	01/23/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		•					
Office Action Summary		Application No.		Applicant(s)	•		
		10/814,441		ERDOGMUS ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Mary C. Jacob		2123			
The MAILING DATE of Period for Reply	f this communication	appears on the cove	r sheet with the c	correspondence address	;		
A SHORTENED STATUTOI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the maili If NO period for reply is specified abo Failure to reply within the set or exter Any reply received by the Office later earned patent term adjustment. See	FROM THE MAILING under the provisions of 37 CFF ng date of this communication. ve, the maximum statutory per dided period for reply will, by stat than three months after the m	DATE OF THIS CO R 1.136(a). In no event, how riod will apply and will expire atute, cause the application t	OMMUNICATION ever, may a reply be tin SIX (6) MONTHS from o become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communi D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1) Responsive to commu	unication(s) filed on <u>3/</u>	<u>/31/04</u> .	•	•			
2a) This action is FINAL .	. ,—	This action is non-fin					
closed in accordance	with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle,	1935 C.D. 11, 49	53 O.G. 213.	•		
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are p	ending in the applicat	ion.					
4a) Of the above claim	n(s) is/are with	drawn from consider	ation.				
5) Claim(s) is/are		.*					
6) Claim(s) is/are							
7) Claim(s) is/are		or election requirem	ent				
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> are sub	ject to restriction and	or election requirem	ent.	· .			
Application Papers			•				
9) The specification is ob	jected to by the Exam	niner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed or							
Applicant may not reque							
				ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.1			
11) The oath or declaration	n is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the	attached Office	Action of form PTO-13	12.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		•				
12) Acknowledgment is ma	ade of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35	5 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c)∐ None of:						
	of the priority docum						
	of the priority docum						
				ed in this National Stag	E		
* See the attached detail	n the International Builded Office action for a			ed.			
See the attached detail	ca Office action for a	not of the contined o	ор, оо ностоонт				
	·						
Attachment(s)		, -	Intensions Common	, (PTO-413)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTC Notice of Draftsperson's Patent I 		4) <u> </u>	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	oate			
3) Information Disclosure Statemen		5) <u> </u>	Notice of Informal I Other:	Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date			, -				

Application/Control Number:

10/814,441 Art Unit: 2123

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-57 have been presented for examination.

Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-21, drawn to an EWC-LMS technique (see specification, paragraph 0026 and Figure 2), classified in class 703, subclass 2.
 - II. Claims 22-57, drawn to an REW technique (see specification, paragraph0031 and Figure 3), classified in class 703, subclass 2.
- 3. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are drawn to two different methods, one being an Error Whitening Criterion-Least Means Squares technique, and the other being a Recursive Error Whitening Technique, both methods requiring different mathematical calculations, and therefore, a different search in the prior art directed toward each method set forth.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number:

10/814,441 Art Unit: 2123

- 4. A telephone call was made to Richard A. Hinson, Reg. No. 47,652 on 1/17/08 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- 5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i)

Application/Control Number:

10/814,441 Art Unit: 2123

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary C. Jacob whose telephone number is 571-272-6249. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Rodriguez can be reached on 571-272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PAUL RODRIGUEZ SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mary C. Jacob Examiner AU2123

MCJ 1/18/07